

Amendments to the Drawings:

Replacement sheets for FIGS. 1-7 are enclosed which formalize the drawings that were submitted with the application. No other changes have been made. Formal drawings are submitted herewith under separate Letter to the Official Draftsperson. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner because Figs. 4a, 4b, and 4c were not clear. Formal drawings are submitted herewith under separate Letter to the Official Draftsperson. It is believed these drawings satisfy the informalities noted by the Examiner. Approval by the Examiner of the changes to the drawings is respectfully requested. Formal drawings incorporating the changes are also submitted herewith under separate letter to the draftsperson.

Claims 1-2 and 6-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Xu (US 6,133,692).

By this amendment, claim 1 has been revised to indicate that the microcavity type structure defined by element b provides red, green or blue light. The color filter element is disposed relative to the first portion of the light emitting area so as to filter only a portion of the red, green or blue light and transmits substantially unfiltered red, green or blue light through the second portion.

So, for example, if you have a red subpixel, only a portion of a red filter will be provided over the red subpixel. As pointed out on page 6, lines 16-25, the result of the claimed structure is that when the subpixel is viewed from an off-angle, the color shift can be reduced.

Turning now Xu, discloses a white light producing device. Color filters are provided on Xu's device to adjust the white color so that the color that is emitted is always white without regard to viewing angle problems. Clearly, Xu doesn't provide any motivation for the structure of amended claim 1, wherein the color filter element filters red, green or blue light produced by the microcavity structure in the first portion of the predetermined light emitting layer and produces unfiltered colored light in the second portion of the predetermined area. Clearly, Xu is directed to a different problem than the present invention. The microcavity of Xu does not provide red, green or blue light but white light. There is no corresponding structure to the color filter element that filters a first portion of the predetermined area while permitting a second portion to transmit unfiltered light.

It is believed that claim 1 defines an unobvious advancement in the art and is patentable over the Xu reference. Claims 2 and 6-7 depend on claim 1 and should be allowable.

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu (US Pat. No. 6,133,692) in view of Forrest (US Pub. No. 2003/0213967).

Claims 3-5 also depend on claim 1 and should therefore be allowable. It is true that Forrest discloses a top and bottom emitting OLED device and a semi-transparent reflector containing silver in an OLED device. However, there is nothing in Forrest that suggests the subject matter discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 8-10 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu (US Pat. No. 6,133,692) in view of Yu (US Pat. No. 6,303,943).

Turning now to claim 8, Applicant believes that it clearly distinguishes over Xu in a manner similar to that discussed with respect to claim 1. In claim 8, there are a plurality of subpixels that emit different colored light. Each subpixel has a predetermined emitting area and in element c the color filter is disposed relative to a first portion of such area to filter light and transmits substantially unfiltered light through the second portion. The Examiner has recognized that Xu does not disclose a multi-color OLED device including different color subpixels that emit different color light. Xu is directed to producing white light.

Yu does not have the filter arrangement set forth in claim 8. Yu is not directed to a display device but describes a photosensor or photodetector structure which responds to received light. Of course there is no off-axis problem in a photo sensor since there is no user viewing of a display image. Accordingly it is believed that Yu is nonanalogous art and provides no motivation for the present invention.

Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu (US Pat. No. 6,133,692) in view of Yu (US Pat. No. 6,303,943) and further in view of Forrest (US Pub. No. 2003/0213967).

These claims depend upon claim 8 and should be allowed along with it. Yu and Forrest have been discussed.

It is believed that these changes now make claim 1 clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicant's attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw

Rochester, NY 14650

Telephone: 585-477-4653

Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.